



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,748	04/11/2002	Shlomo Ben-Haim	298858-00110 (228770)	7537
83380	7590	09/11/2009		
William H. Dippert Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC U.S. Steel Tower 600 Grant Street, 44th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15219			EXAMINER HOLMES, REX R	
			ART UNIT 3762	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/11/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipmail@eckertseamans.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/980,748	Applicant(s) BEN-HAIM ET AL.	
	Examiner REX HOLMES	Art Unit 3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5,6,8,12,14,34,35,39,44,49,50,52 and 53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5,6,8,12,14,34,35,39,44,49,50,52 and 53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/28/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of claims 34-35, 39 and 44 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Prystowski. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 34-35, 39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are directed to determining that ventricular fibrillation is occurring. The originally filed disclosure is silent as to the system determining ventricular fibrillation in combination with the other elements of the claim. It is noted that the originally filed disclosure has support for determining fibrillation but fails to disclose determining ventricular fibrillation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3762

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 5-6, 14, 34, 39, 44 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Prystowski et al. (U.S. Pat. 4,554,922 hereinafter "Prystowski").

6. Regarding claims 5-6, 14, 34, 39, 44 and 49, Prystowski discloses a system that determines either atrial or ventricular fibrillation (Col. 1, ll. 5-8), applies multiple pulses at a rate greater than 10 Hz (e.g. Col. 2, ll. 57-65) with a power less than 100W (e.g. 2mA signal applied to the heart (60 Ohms) = peak power of 0.24mW), less than 1 joule (15 pulses with a power of 0.24mW lasting 2ms each) and an amplitude less than 50mA (e.g. Col. 2, ll. 57-62). Prystowski further discloses that the device terminates the pulses (e.g. Fig. 6, Col. 5, ll. 19-24; Col. 5, line 61 to Col. 6, line 15) and monitors the electrical signals of the heart indicative of motion (e.g. Col. 5, ll. 24-32). Prystowski further discloses that the device modifies the pulses based on the signal (e.g. Col 6, line 60 to Col. 7, line 12; Col. 5, line 61 to Col. 6, line 15).

7. Regarding claim 6, Prystowski further discloses that the device can apply the stimulation during the refractory period to inhibit propagation of the heart waves (e.g. Col. 3, ll. 25-53; Col. 5, line 61 to Col. 6, line 15).

8. It is noted that Prystowski applies the pulses at one frequency and then terminates the signal by reducing the frequency to zero which is a second frequency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 3762

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 12 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prystowski et al. (U.S. Pat. 4,554,922 hereinafter "Prystowski").

12. Prystowski discloses the claimed invention as discussed in detail above. Prystowski further discloses utilizing multiple electrodes and multiple stimulus signals (e.g. Col. 6, ll. 16-45). However, Prystowski fails to explicitly state that the signals that are sent to each electrode are either the same or different. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Prystowski with varying electrical signals for each electrode as it would provide the predictable result of supplying a custom signal for each electrode that would work together in order to inhibit the response and not propagate it.

13. Claims 8, 35 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prystowski in view of Ideker et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0123771 hereinafter "Ideker").

Art Unit: 3762

14. Prystowski discloses the claimed invention as discussed in detail above, but fails to disclose pacing while applying the defibrillation signal. However, Ideker discloses that it is known in the art to pace the heart while applying defibrillation signals as it lowers the strength of the signal needed to defibrillate (e.g. Paragraph 126). It is further noted that Ideker fails to disclose the frequency of the pacing signal but it is common knowledge in the art that that typical pacing is 1Hz to keep the heart steadily pumping at 60 beats a minute. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Prystowski with the pacing while defibrillating as taught by Ideker to provide the predictable results of lowering the strength of the defibrillation signal needed to defibrillate the heart.

15. Claims 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prystowski in view of Min et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,713,924 hereinafter "Min").

16. Prystowski discloses the claimed invention as discussed in detail above, but fails to disclose applying a fencing while applying the defibrillation signal. However, Min discloses applying a fencing signal to the heart while applying the defibrillation signal in order to lower the energy pulse needed to defibrillate the heart (e.g. Col. 3, ll. 50-54, Fig. 3; Col. 12, line 60 to Col. 13, line 20). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Prystowski with the fencing signals while defibrillating as taught by Min to provide the predictable results of lowering the strength of the defibrillation signal needed to defibrillate the heart.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REX HOLMES whose telephone number is (571)272-8827. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 3762

/George R Evanisko/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3762